

MI Child Support Formula - Abolish 128 Day law

From: <Pikhuehunter@aol.com>
To: <MCSF@courts.mi.gov.>
Date: 6/20/2003 12:43 PM
Subject: Abolish 128 Day law

You Honor,

I am a Mom of three. The current support my children receive is 230 a week. I have sole custody as well. The payer makes over 50K a year. Honestly that is low enough. His parenting time is every other weekend Thursday-Sunday (4 nights). As it stands right now I track each over night that they spend with their father, to protect our household. I only have 8 extra days to "play" with. So I pick and choose wisely to avoid ANOTHER trip to court. If he gets 129 days you better believe he will drag me back to court to modify the current custody arrangement that we implemented in 2001. THAT trial in itself was 20,000 dollars, just my side. I don't want to see a single dollar that I could raise my kids with go to the court system.

It is sad to say... but to avoid this my kids are held back from additional opportunities to visit with their father overnight. And if he doesn't have them OVERNIGHT, he rarely wants to spend additional time with them. As it is, the time they are at their father's home, he isn't readily available to him due to his work schedule. I'd love to accommodate his additional requests, but limit them for fear of litigation and an upset in continuity. Changing the law would make me say NO every time he asks. With current standing (128 day law) some custodial parent's deny extra visitation for peace of mind and security. Not always out of spite. If this proposal is put into place, kids will see the non-custodial parent LESS. Is this truly in the best interest of the child? I can guarantee you though, if the 128 day law is lifted/abolished, children will flow easily back and forth between the parents. Why? It will no longer be about the money!

I urge you not to shorten the number of days... but to abolish the 128 rule altogether. While the 128 day law may protect the payer, it places money in front of what may be in the best interest of the child, and that is access to both parents.

Thanks,

KC, Saline, MI
734*944*2063